DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 163 HE 024 274

AUTHOR Allen, Mary J.; And Others
TITLE Alumni Perceptions of the Impact of Race/Ethnicity on Their University Experience.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (Boston, MA, August, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alumni; Asian Americans; Attitudes; Behavioral Sciences; Black Students; *Educational Practices; *Ethnic Bias; Ethnic Discrimination; Ethnic Groups; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; *Racial Bias; Racial Discrimination; Racial Factors; *Student Attitudes; Trend Analysis; Whites
IDENTIFIERS California State University; Differentiation

ABSTRACT

This study examines alumni's perceptions of differential treatment on the basis of race/ethnicity by faculty, students, and staff/administrators in five behavioral science disciplines at eight independent California State University campuses. Reports of personal experiences by 2,078 alumni in four ethnic groups (Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites) are compared and examined for patterns of changed opinions over time. Both positive and negative differential treatment and the effects of proportional minority enrollment are considered. The effects of perceived racism on alumni reports of their intellectual and personal development and the qualities of their programs are analyzed. The majority of respondents in each ethnic group indicated that their ethnicity/race did not affect their treatment. There was a tendency for respondents to report more positive than negative treatment. At least one source of unfavorable treatment was indicated by 31% of Black alumni, 16% of Hispanic alumni, 9% of Asian alumni, and 3% of White alumni. (17 references) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

Alumni Perceptions of the Impact of Race/Ethnicity on their University Experience

Mary J. Allen, Beth M. Rienzi, and Colin A. Armstrong

California State University, Bakersfield

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, August, 1990

ED329163

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary J. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 024 224

This research was supported by Applied Research Center grants from Academic Program Improvement (API), Chancellor's Office, The California State University, and the University Research Council, California State University, Bakersfield.

RIncreased concern over the underrepresentation of minority Americans among university graduates is especially evident in California, since the state's population is increasingly composed of minority groups. In 1987, Hispanics represented about 23% of the state's population, but only 10% of the California State University (CSU) graduates; and blacks were about 8% of the population, but only 5% of the CSU graduates. Whites and Asians were overrepresented among CSU graduates, representing 60 and 9% of the population and 69 and 13% of CSU graduates, respectively.

Racism in education has far reaching consequences, since it may work to systematically exclude minorities from obtaining the academic qualifications for economic success and community leadership. Racism reduces the retention of minority students (e.g., Beckham, 1988; McClain, 1982) who drop out because of feelings of social estrangement in a hostile environment (e.g., Farrell, 1988; Loo & Rolison, 1986). Some of this estrangement may be ameliorated when minority students have access to support within their racial/ethnic community (Boyd, 1979; Dinka, Mazzella, & Pilant, 1980). Feelings of isolation and alienation may be exaggerated when students cannot interact with others sharing their race and culture, so minority students may select a college or major that is popular with others in their ethnic group (Loo & Rolison, 1986).

Minority students may enter the university with self esteem lowered by participation in an unsupportive society (e.g., Beckham,

1988), and their self esteem may be further eroded in a discriminatory environment. For example, Asamen and Berry (1987), after reviewing the literature on Asian American college students, concluded that they tend to be more socially isolated, anxious, lonely, alienated, and rejected than other college students. Those who felt more alienated tended to have lower self concepts.

Faculty interactions appear to be one of the most critical factors in minority persistence (e.g., Beckham, 1988; Loo & Rolison, 1986); however, faculty may be the primary source of discrimination on campus (e.g., Boyd, 1979; Rutledge, 1982; Sedlacek, 1987).

Minority concerns in higher education have changed over the last thirty years. The goal of the 1960s was to gain access to white-dominated colleges and universities. Even a token minority population on a predominantly white campus was seen as progress (Rosenthal, 1979). The 1970s, with increased minority involvement in higher education, seemed to promise a reduction in racism (Boyd, 1979). However, some Black students found a hostile environment (Farrell, 1988; Hale, 1975) and turned their attention to the increased need for Black professors and administrators (Carrington & Sedlacek, 1977). Complaints of reverse discrimination (e.g., Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978) began to emerge.

The 1980s presented new problems. Rutledge (1982) noted that many of the gains made by Blacks were declining; and some evidence suggests an increased tolerance for people with racist attitudes on college campuses (Sedlacek, 1987). Farrell (1988) notes a significant

persistence of racism in the college setting evident in racist themes at fraternity parties, subtly different treatment by professors, and comments written on dormitory room doors.

Farrell and Jones (1988) report a recent increase in racial conflict at predominantly white universities. They conclude there is an "epidemic of bigotry" (p. 213) within contemporary American society, perhaps related to societal uncertainty about our economic future, leading to personal insecurity and the need to self-protect, rather than to protect and support the rights of minorities. They also argue that today's minority college students "represent the most assertive minority generation ever to enter higher education" (p. 219), since they are the products of social changes in the 1960s and early 1970s. These assertive minority students are less likely to quietly tolerate racist behavior. Farrell and Jones argue that these cultural views, tied to their underpreparedness for academic work, have led to a white backlash against them, especially in these times of economic uncertainty.

Rosenthal (1980) concludes from survey evidence that overt racism declined in the 1970s. Annual National Opinion Research Center survey data revealed decreased tolerance for segregated schools and increased tolerance for inter-racial social relationships, such as inter-racial neighborhoods and marriages. However, Rosenthal finds a growth in "symbolic" racism marked by the increasing proportion of whites who support the rights of individuals to self-segregate by race. Symbolic racism is reflected in the use of abstract

ideas that appear to be non-racist, but that serve to maintain the white-dominant status quo. Symbolic racists oppose affirmative action, busing, and other social programs that disrupt whites' ability to segregate themselves. Symbolic racists do not support segregated schools in mixed-race neighborhoods, but they do support de facto school segregation in racially-segregated communities.

Rosenthal believes an important component of symbolic racism is the white attitude that programs benefiting blacks have gone far enough or too far, so that reverse discrimination against whites is threatened. Collison (1987) blames increases in racism on "the conservative climate in the country, white frustration with affirmative action, and lack of historical awareness about the civil-rights movement" (p. 42). Farrell (1988) agrees that those white students who are the most ignorant of history are the most likely to feel minorities are being given unfair advantage over white students.

The incidence of racism is difficult to assess because researchers have used different operational definitions. Survey techniques appear to be the most appropriate methodology to collect incidence data for large populations, but survey questions have varied. Most of the published research involves judgments by Black students, generally comparing them to white students at predominantly white universities (e.g., Boyd, 1979; Dinka, et al., 1980; Frisbie, 1980; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Rosenthal, 1979; Rutledge, 1982).

Because so many different questions about racism have been asked, it is difficult to track changes in student opinions. Boyd's

(1979) analysis suggests reduced racial tension in the 1970s, and recent evidence (e.g., Farrell & Jones, 1988) suggests an increase during the 1980s. These studies also demonstrate that Black students are more aware of racial discrimination than white students (e.g., Dinka, et al., 1980) and more consistently assert that Black students are victims of white discrimination (e.g., Rutledge, 1982). White students are more likely than Black students to see whites as the victims of racism (e.g., Rutledge, 1982); and faculty are frequently perceived to be the sources of racism, especially by Black students (e.g., Rosenthal, 1979).

This study examines differential treatment on the basis of race/ethnicity by faculty, students, and staff/administrators at eight independent California State University campuses. Reports of personal experiences by alumni in four ethnic groups (Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and whites) are compared and examined for patterns of changed opinions over time. Both positive and negative differential treatment and the effects of proportional minority enrollment are considered, unlike most studies which examine only negative racism and which do not yield data comparable across campuses. In addition, the effects of perceived racism on alumni reports of their intellectual and personal development and the qualities of their programs are analyzed.

It is hypothesized that minority alumni will report more unfavorable treatment on the basis of their ethnicity/race than white alumni. This should be especially true for Black alumni. Minority

alumni reports of racism are expected to diminish during the 1970s, then climb in the 1980s. More recently graduated white alumni are expected to demonstrate increased concern about negative treatment on the basis of their race. Since minority group members appear to be more aware than whites of the effects of their race on others, they are expected to report more favorable, as well as more unfavorable differential treatment. Alumni who view themselves as the victims of faculty racism are expected to express more dissatisfaction with the quality of their major program and may report less benefits from their university education.

Two models have been applied to campus racial discrimination (e.g., Farrell & Jones, 1988; Loo & Rolison, 1986) that can be examined in this study: a cognitive dissonance model and a personal threat model. The cognitive dissonance model hypothesizes that discrepancy between the representation of non-whites on the campus and in the state leads to cognitive dissonance among whites; this dissonance is resolved by supporting educational equity programs aimed at increasing minority participation on campuses. Under this model, ethnic groups that are the most underrepresented (Hispanics in the state of California) should be given the most support, Blacks (who are less underrepresented in the CSU) should also be given support, and Asians (who are proportionally overrepresented in the CSU) should be given no special support. Faculty and administrators, who control academic programs that affect minority students, should have more cognitive dissonance than students, so minority

perceptions should reflect the most favorable treatment from campus officials.

The personal threat model postulates that discrimination rises when whites are threatened by high minority participation rates, since they are competing for the same resources. The personal threat model suggests that Asians and Blacks, who represent smaller portions of the population, are less threatening to whites than Hispanics, since Hispanics are the largest minority group in California, so discrimination should most often affect Hispanics. Under this model, white students should be more threatened than faculty or other campus employees, since they are competing with minority students for grades, jobs, and graduate school openings, so minority alumni should report the most racism from other students.

Method

Alumni were sampled for five behavioral science disciplines (Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology) from eight campuses in the CSU system. These campuses represent all major geographical areas in the state. The CSU system consists of 20 campuses and currently enrolls over 365,000 students. Contacts for each of the five programs on each of the eight selected campuses, who were guaranteed campus and alumni confidentiality, generated a list of names and addresses of all known alumni.

Random or universal samples were drawn for each program, depending on population sizes; and alumni were contacted at least twice, first with a cover letter and questionnaire, then with a follow-up

postcard reminding them to return the materials. If fewer than 50 questionnaires were returned for any of the 40 programs, either a third mailing was made to non-respondents, or, if the list contained more possible respondents, a new replacement sample was drawn and contacted. The estimated return rate is 28%, which is conservative since we were unable to calculate the number of letters that did not reach the alumni because of address and name changes.

The questionnaire had been designed and previously tested on a pilot campus and contained four pages of questions that collected demographic information, ratings of contributions of the major to student development, and ratings of aspects of program quality. The following question was included: "To the very best of your knowledge, did any person in the following groups treat you especially favorably or negatively because of your race, ethnicity, or color?" The four groups were "Other Students," "Faculty in Your Major," "Other Faculty," and "Other University Administrators/Staff." The three possible responses were "No," "Yes, mostly negative," and "Yes, mostly positive."

A sample of 2078 alumni was drawn from the original sample of 2157 alumni by selecting respondents in four targeted ethnic groups: Asian, Black, Hispanic, and white alumni. Ethnicity was determined from responses to the question, "What race or ethnic group do you consider yourself?" This question supplied six options: White, Black, American Indian, Hispanic, Asian, and Other.

The 2078 alumni had graduated between 1934 and 1988, with most (93%) of the sample graduating after 1969. From 198 to 296 represented each campus, with 320 to 477 from each degree program. The proportion of white respondents from the campuses ranged from 73 to 98%, with a median of 91%. Demographic characteristics are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. There were significant relationships between ethnicity and gender, $\chi^2(3, n=2070)=11.01$, $p<.05$, between ethnicity and major, $\chi^2(12, N=2078)=26.66$, $p<.01$, and between ethnicity and year of graduation, $\chi^2(12, n=2062)=36.56$, $p<.0005$. There was a higher proportion of males among Black and Hispanic alumni than among Asian and white alumni. Asian alumni tended to major in Sociology and Economics; Black alumni tended to major in Sociology and Political Science; Hispanic alumni tended to major in Sociology and Political Science, but were more evenly spread across the majors than the other two minority groups; and white alumni were rather evenly divided across the majors. As shown in Table 2, the proportion of Asian and Hispanic alumni increased, while the proportion of white alumni decreased in recent years. One-way analyses of variance found no significant differences between the ethnic groups on present age and on age at graduation.

Results

Table 3 summarizes responses to the question of differential treatment associated with ethnicity/race. The majority of respondents in each ethnic group indicated that their ethnicity/race did not affect

their treatment by faculty, students, or administrators/staff. Differential treatment responses were significantly related to race/ethnicity for each of the four sources, $\chi^2(6, n=2001)=146.36$, $p<.0001$ for faculty in the major, $\chi^2(6, n=1989)=137.61$, $p<.0001$ for other faculty, $\chi^2(6, n=2005)=97.10$, $p<.0001$ for other students, and $\chi^2(6, n=1985)=85.10$, $p<.0001$ for administrators/staff. Black alumni most often reported their race had an effect, and Asian and white alumni least often reported an effect.

In general, there was a tendency for respondents to report more positive than negative treatment. Significant differences in the proportion of positive and negative responses were found for all four sources of differential treatment when all alumni are included: $\chi^2(1, n=191)=89.85$, $p<.005$ for faculty in the major, $\chi^2(1, n=176)=32.82$, $p<.005$ for other faculty, $\chi^2(1, n=176)=76.45$, $p<.005$ for other students, and $\chi^2(1, n=176)=48.09$, $p<.005$ for administrators/staff. When only minority students were examined, there was a significant difference in the proportion of positive and negative responses only for the question dealing with faculty in the major, $\chi^2(1, n=59)=12.36$, $p<.005$.

Racism is indicated whenever a respondent indicates unfavorable treatment from at least one of the four sources. A significant relationship between race and the reporting of racism was found, $\chi^2(3, n=2019)=121.61$, $p<.0001$. At least one source of unfavorable treatment was indicated by 31% of Black alumni, 16% of Hispanic alumni, 9% of Asian alumni, and 3% of white alumni.

Respondents were grouped by year of graduation: 1934-69, 1970-75, 1976-80, 1981-84, and 1985-88. As presented in Table 4, the percentage of alumni reporting at least one source of negative treatment varied significantly with time of graduation (peaking in the early 1970s and among the most recent graduates), $\chi^2(4, n=2003)=10.16$, $p<.05$. This relationship was significant among white alumni, $\chi^2(4, n=1765)=25.61$, $p<.0001$, but was not significant among minority alumni.

Two chi square analyses examined differences between men and women and between the five majors in the proportions reporting at least one racist source. Neither test was significant. The Spearman correlation between the proportion of alumni reporting at least one racist source and the proportion of white enrollments at each of the eight campuses was significant, $r=-.63$, $p<.05$. Two of the four Spearman correlations between the reporting of negative treatment from each of the four sources and the proportion of white enrollments at each campus were significant, $r=-.78$, $p<.05$ for treatment from other faculty and $r=-.87$, $p<.005$ for treatment from administrators/staff. Calculated only among minority students, one of these Spearman correlations was significant, for the relationship between the proportion of alumni reporting at least one racist source and the proportion of white enrollments, $r=-.71$, $p<.05$.

How did differential treatment on the basis of race/ethnicity affect alumni perceptions of their learning and their major program? Twenty items on the questionnaire asked alumni to rate the major's

contribution to their development. These items were factor analyzed and yielded four factors: Personal Growth, Basic Skills, Scientific Principles, and Cultural Diversity. (One of the original items loaded on multiple factors and was excluded from subsequent analyses). Five items that asked students to rate the quality of aspects of their experience as students (e.g., quality of advising) and an item that asked if they were challenged by the faculty in their major were factor analyzed and yielded one factor: Program Quality. Five factor scores were created by averaging standard scores for the relevant variables, and, to reduce the effects of missing data, factor scores were created if no more than one relevant item was omitted. Table 5 lists the items contributing to each factor.

Five one-way analyses of variance compared alumni who differed in their perception of the effect of their race/ethnicity on how they were treated by faculty in their major. Three of these five analyses were significant. Relevant statistics and the results of follow-up Student-Newman-Keuls tests are summarized in Table 6. Alumni who perceived major faculty as responding mostly positively to them because of their race/ethnicity rated the benefits of the major in personal growth and the learning of scientific principles and the overall program quality significantly higher than alumni who reported the opposite experience.

Discussion

The majority of alumni in each ethnic group reported their race/ethnicity did not influence their treatment by faculty,

administrators/staff, or other students. Those who felt their ethnicity had an impact were at least as likely to report favorable as unfavorable treatment. Faculty in the major probably have a great impact on student retention (e.g., Beckham, 1988; Loo & Rolison, 1986), and alumni report that these faculty more often treat them favorably than unfavorably. Overall, most alumni do not report their personal experience in the CSU as being in a racist or race-focused environment.

Black alumni were the most likely to report their ethnicity influenced their treatment by others; 31% of Black alumni reported at least one source of racism. Their reports of differential treatment most often indicated that faculty's responses were affected by their race, and they tended to view faculty in their major more positively than they viewed other faculty. This pattern suggests that Black students may choose or reject majors on the basis of their perceptions of faculty's acceptance or rejection of them.

About 80% of Hispanic alumni reported no differential treatment on the basis of their ethnicity from each of the four sources. In general, those who perceived differential treatment from faculty viewed this treatment as more positive than negative; but they were about as likely to report favorable as unfavorable treatment from students and administrators/staff. Cognitive dissonance theory would predict that Hispanics receive the most favorable treatment from other students, as the most underrepresented minority group in the CSU; but this was not found. The personal threat model was given

some support, since Hispanics were the most likely to report negative treatment by other students.

Asian alumni were less likely to report differential treatment than other minority students, and they generally reported favorable treatment, rather than racism. Since they are proportionally overrepresented on CSU campuses and are a small minority group in the state, neither theory predicts they should receive special treatment (favorable or unfavorable), so their lower rate of reporting differential treatment is consistent with both models.

White alumni were the least likely to report differential treatment and had the highest ratio of favorable to unfavorable reports for each treatment source. Only 1 or 2% noted unfavorable treatment from any single source, suggesting that the threat of reverse discrimination is not preeminent. However, the percentage of white alumni reporting negative treatment from at least one source peaked in two periods: the early 1970s and the late 1980s. Both periods may be times when more whites felt personally threatened by the demands and presence of minorities on campus. Recent white alumni may have some of the attitudes associated with symbolic racism (Rosenthal, 1980), but these data do not provide an examination of this hypothesis.

Minority expression of negative treatment did not significantly vary with year of graduation, suggesting that racism, from their perspective, has been a relatively constant phenomenon. This was true for about 20% of minority students in each time period. Black students were the most likely to report at least one racism source.

Their rate was almost twice that of Hispanics, over three times the rate for Asians, and over 10 times the rate for whites. Neither the cognitive dissonance model nor the personal threat model, in their simplest interpretation, would predict this pattern. Previous suggestions that American racism most frequently affects Blacks (e.g., Farrell & Jones, 1988; Rutledge, 1982) are confirmed.

Reports of racism were more common on campuses with higher minority enrollments. Both cognitive dissonance theory and personal threat theory would predict more non-minority support for minority students on campuses having fewer minorities, so both are consistent with this result. Minority students appear to be faced with a choice between their need for a campus with strong cultural support from a minority population (Boyd, 1979; Dinka et al., 1980; Loo & Rolison, 1986) and their need to avoid a racist environment. However, the relationships between minority enrollment rates and racism from specific sources (faculty, etc.) were not significant among minority students and the majority of students report no racism, so the problem is not as serious as it could be.

Alumni who feel they have been negatively treated by faculty in their major because of their race/ethnicity report less personal growth and less learning of scientific principles than those who report being favorably treated by these faculty; and they rate overall quality of their programs lower. The perception of racism appears to undermine some of the goals of higher education, while the perception of favorable treatment is associated with reports of higher student

learning and more positive attitudes toward aspects of their program. This suggested influence of faculty attitudes on student development is consistent with previous research (e.g., Loo & Rolison, 1986).

A number of specific hypotheses were made. As hypothesized, minority alumni reported more differential treatment on the basis of their ethnicity/race than white alumni, including both favorable and unfavorable treatment, and the reports of differential treatment were most often made by Black alumni. Reports of racism were most often made by alumni who graduated in the early 1970s and late 1980s, as expected; however, this result was only true for white alumni. Reports of racism by minority alumni were not significantly related to year of graduation, and their trend was in the reverse direction. As predicted, alumni who reported being unfavorably treated because of their race/ethnicity gave lower ratings of program quality and some aspects of their learning (personal skills and scientific principles) than alumni who reported favorable treatment.

Two theories were contrasted. Cognitive dissonance theory led to predictions that Hispanic alumni will most often report favorable treatment, especially from campus personnel. This was not confirmed. The prediction that Asian alumni will least often report favorable treatment was partially supported; they less often reported favorable treatment than the other minority groups, but more than white alumni. The prediction that campus personnel will be viewed more often as offering favorable treatment than other students was not supported.

The personal threat theory led to the hypothesis that Hispanic alumni should more often report negative treatment than the other minority groups, especially from other students. This was partially supported. Hispanic alumni more often reported negative treatment than Asian alumni, but less often reported negative treatment than Black alumni. The prediction that minority alumni will report more racism from students than from campus personnel was not supported. However, Hispanic alumni did have this pattern, providing some support for this model.

Both models would predict that campuses with the lowest minority participation rates would have the least racism; this was supported for overall racism (indicated by reference to negative treatment from at least one source), but was not supported among minority respondents when each source of differential treatment was considered separately. In summary, neither theory appears to predict the overall pattern of results well. Predictions of discrimination probably require more complicated theoretical models.

All data for this study were collected simultaneously, so reflect current perceptions, rather than perceptions at the time of graduation. It is possible that less recent graduates' memories are less accurate than those of more recent graduates or are influenced by other events during their lifetimes. It is also possible that behaviors that are considered racist at one period may not be so labeled in another, so data across years may not be directly comparable. For example, Farrell and Jones (1988) argue that today's minority

university students are the products of earlier social changes, so they have different expectations than earlier generations. Attributions are important ways to channel stress and maintain self esteem, and different generations of college graduates may have used different attributions for their experiences, based on different expectations.

White alumni's reports of negative treatment ("reverse discrimination") appear to peak during the time periods that we hypothesized peaks among minority students. It is interesting that minority alumni complaints tended to be lower at these very times, as if education is a prize in a zero-sum game and groups of whites and minorities cannot be satisfied simultaneously. The Spearman correlation between the proportions of minority alumni and white alumni reporting at least one racist source, as summarized in Table 4, is .78 across the five time periods, supporting this notion. This is more consistent with the personal threat theory, since minority gains are associated with white perceptions of losses. While this relationship is suggested, it must be remembered that most alumni did not report any negative treatment on the basis of their ethnicity.

Responses analyzed in this study were only from students who persisted to graduation. Students who perceive the university environment as racist may be more likely to drop out (e.g., Farrell, 1988), so the incidence of campus racism may be underestimated among graduates. The minority students most apt to survive in the university may be resilient, able to perceive race as an asset and

professors as supportive. Alumni responses may overestimate the incidence of favorable treatment on the basis of ethnicity/race.

These results are based on self-report data, and it cannot be determined if they reflect actual racism or alumni's inaccurate perceptions or oversensitivity to others' behaviors. An anecdote illustrates this problem. A foreign student once mentioned to one of us that a faculty member gave her an A on a paper and commented that her paper was excellent for a foreign student, intimating that her paper may have received a lower grade if she were an American. Was this favorable or unfavorable treatment? The student was insulted and described this as a negative experience. The faculty member probably considered this special, favorable treatment and did not recognize the more subtle, condescending message. Faculty may be found "guilty" of more subtle forms of "racism" as they make special attempts to encourage minority students and meet educational equity goals. Faculty can be viewed as prejudiced if they treat all students identically or if they treat each student differently. Educational institutions need to devise methods to provide educational equity programs that do not undermine the confidence and self esteem of any student and that allow minority group members to retain their cultural identities.

References

Asamen, J. K., & Berry, G. L. (1987). Self-concept, alienation, and perceived prejudice: Implications for counseling Asian Americans. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 15, 146-160.

Beckham, B. (1988, Fall 1987- Winter 1988). Strangers in a strange land: The experience of Blacks on white campuses. Educational Record, pp.74-78.

Boyd, W. M. (1979). Today's Black students: A success story. AGB Reports, 21(5), 6-12.

Carrington, C. H., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1977). Attitudes and characteristics of Black graduate students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 467-471.

Collison, M. N. (1987, March 18). Racial incidents worry campus officials, prompt U. of Massachusetts study. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 41-43.

Dinka, F., Mazzella, F., & Pilant, D. E. (1980). Reconciliation and confirmation: Blacks and whites at a predominantly white university. Journal of Black Studies, 11, 55-76.

Farrell, C. S. (1988, January 27). Black students seen facing 'new racism' on many campuses: Environment at 'white' colleges viewed as hostile to minorities. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp.1, 36-38.

Farrell, W. C., Jr., & Jones, C. K. (1988). Recent racial incidents in higher education: A preliminary perspective. The Urban Review, 20, 211-226.

Frisbie, L. (1980). A study of racism and sexism at Georgia Southwestern College. Integrated Education, 18(5-6), 61-64.

Hale, F. W. (1975). A sprinkle of pepper: The state of Black influence in white colleges and universities. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 3(2), 45-52.

Loo, C. M. & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. Journal of Higher Education, 57, 58-77.

McClain, B. R. (1982). Racism in higher education: A societal reflection. The Negro Educational Review, 33(1), 34-45.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U. S. 265 (1978).

Rosenthal, S. J. (1979). Racism and desegregation at Old Dominion University. Integrated Education, 17(1-2), 40-42.

Rosenthal, S. J. (1980). Symbolic racism and desegregation: Divergent attitudes and perceptions of Black and white university students. Phylon, 41, 257-266.

Rutledge, E. M. (1982). Students' perceptions of racism in higher education. Integrated Education, 20(3-5), 106-111.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black students on white campuses: 20 years of research. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 484-495.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	All Groups	Ethnicity*			
		Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
N	2078	72	55	116	1835
% Male	50	45	60	62	48
% Anthropology	15	8	7	12	16
% Economics	20	29	14	16	20
% Political Sci.	19	10	26	22	19
% Psychology	23	19	20	19	23
% Sociology	23	33	33	30	22
Age M	36.55	34.38	37.49	35.21	36.70
Age (SD)	9.58	10.76	10.22	9.27	9.52
Graduation Age M	27.36	26.10	29.18	27.52	27.34
Graduation Age (SD)	8.07	7.94	9.24	6.98	8.10

*significant ethnic group differences in gender ($p<.05$) and major ($p<.01$).

Table 2

Percent of Alumni by Graduation Year

Year	% of Sample	Ethnicity*			
		Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
1985-88	22	6	3	9	82
1981-84	25	2	4	5	89
1976-80	24	2	3	4	91
1970-75	22	4	1	6	89
1934-69	7	2	3	3	93

*significant ethnic group differences, $p<.0005$.

Table 3

Percent of Alumni Reporting Differential Treatment due to Race/Ethnicity

Group	Source of Treatment			
	Major Faculty*	Other Faculty*	Other Students*	Admin./ Staff*
Asian				
Neutral	83	88	87	83
Unfavorable	3	4	3	4
Favorable	14	7	10	13
Black				
Neutral	59	62	71	67
Unfavorable	17	23	7	14
Favorable	24	15	22	19
Hispanic				
Neutral	77	77	80	81
Unfavorable	5	8	10	9
Favorable	19	14	10	11
White				
Neutral	92	93	93	93
Unfavorable	1	2	1	1
Favorable	7	6	6	6

*significant ethnic group differences, $p<.0001$.

Table 4

Percent of Alumni Reporting at Least One Source of Negative Treatment by Year of Graduation

Year of Graduation	Total Sample*	Minority Groups	Whites Only**
1985-88	7	10	6
1981-84	4	22	1
1976-80	4	24	2
1970-75	6	15	5
1934-69	3	18	2

*$p<.05$. **$p<.0001$.

Table 5
Items Comprising Each of the Five Factors

Personal Skills
Being independent, self-reliant
Being adaptable, able to adjust to people and situations
Understanding my own abilities, interests, and personality
Being able to identify values and respond ethically
Believing that learning is a life-long process
Working cooperatively in a group
Leading and guiding others
Cultural Diversity
Understanding the roles of men and women
Understanding ethnic and minority cultures in the United States
Understanding other cultures in the world
Basic Skills
Planning and carrying out projects
Writing effectively
Speaking effectively
Understanding written information
Scientific Principles
Recognizing assumptions, making logical inferences, and reaching correct conclusions
Understanding and applying scientific principles and methods
Understanding and applying statistics and/or mathematical models
Understanding the impact of technology and science
Knowing subject matter and theories of major
Program Quality
Accessibility of faculty in major
Helpfulness of advising in major
Quality of the courses in the major
Availability of courses for the major
How often did the faculty in your major challenge you to do the very best you could do?

Table 6

Comparisons of Groups Reporting Differential Treatment by Faculty in the Major

Factor	Type of Treatment Reported					
	Neutral		Unfavorable		Favorable	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Personal Growth[a]	.00	.72	-.14	.89	.19	.65
Scientific Principles[b]	.01	.72	-.34	.89	.06	.70
Program Quality[c]	.00	.72	-.57	.86	.16	.68

[a] $F(2, 1748)=5.25$, $p<.01$. Favorable group significantly different from the neutral group.

[b] $F(2, 1877)=3.86$, $p<.05$. Unfavorable group significantly different from the other two groups.

[c] $F(2,1965)=12.84$, $p<.0001$. All three groups significantly different.